

HEAVY QUARK FRAGMENTATION INTO HEAVY MESONS*

R. L. Jaffe and L. Randall[†]

*Center for Theoretical Physics
Laboratory for Nuclear Science
and Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 U.S.A.*

ABSTRACT

We present a QCD based interpretation of heavy quark fragmentation which utilizes the heavy quark mass expansion. By distinguishing between perturbative and non-perturbative QCD effects, we show how to reliably extract mass independent parameters characterizing the fragmentation function. Because these parameters are quark mass independent, this procedure should permit tests of heavy quark symmetry. Furthermore, we show that heavy quark mass corrections vanish at order m^2/Q^2 in QCD. There also exist higher twist corrections of order $\Lambda m/Q^2$ and $\frac{\alpha_{QCD}}{\pi} \frac{m^2}{Q^2} \ln(Q^2/m^2)$ which we relate to the leading twist fragmentation function.

Submitted to: *Nuclear Physics B*

CTP#2189

hep-ph/9306201

May 1993

* This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U. S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under contract #DE-AC02-76ER03069, and in part by the Texas National Research Laboratory Commission under grant #RGFY92C6.

[†] National Science Foundation Young Investigator Award.
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Research Fellowship.
Department of Energy Outstanding Junior Investigator Award.

I. INTRODUCTION

Heavy quark effective theories have led to considerable insight into the properties of hadrons containing b - and c -quarks. Key among the assumptions underlying the heavy quark theory is that one can expand matrix elements in Λ/m , where Λ is some QCD related scale, m is the heavy quark mass, and where coefficients in the expansion are independent of m . We show in this paper that a similar expansion of the moments of the heavy quark fragmentation function leads to valuable information about the heavy quark fragmentation function both in leading twist and beyond. We derive a parameterization of the fragmentation function which involves heavy quark mass independent parameters and show how the leading parameters can be readily extracted from the lowest moments. This permits tests of heavy quark symmetry. In particular, the fragmentation function of the b - and c -quarks, both of which have been already studied and will be better measured in the future,^{1,2} are readily related. We show that the commonly used Peterson fragmentation function³ has a misleading dependence on the QCD scale and heavy quark mass; the width is linear and not quadratic in the ratio.

The basic idea underlying our analysis is very simple. Fragmentation and distribution functions measured at a scale Q^2 evolve from “boundary data” — forward matrix elements of bilocal heavy quark operators — supplied at some reference scale μ^2 . This boundary data incorporates the non-perturbative features of the fragmentation function (at least in regions sufficiently far from $z = 0$ and $z = 1$ where we will see heavy quark methods and perturbation theory respectively break down). By evaluating the matrix elements at sufficiently low renormalization mass scales, one can exploit heavy quark symmetry to derive a heavy quark independent parameterization of the structure function. At this low mass scale, the boundary

data can be organized as a power series in Λ/m , with mass independent coefficients. The measured fragmentation function is then obtained by evolving the function to Q^2 via perturbative QCD.

Previous work on heavy quark fragmentation functions either has been completely phenomenological³ or has concentrated on the fragmentation function generated by perturbative evolution alone.⁴ Some authors have explored the possibility of describing the fragmentation function solely in terms of perturbative QCD.⁵ We abandon the objective of previous authors of deriving the fragmentation function. We distinguish between perturbative contributions which can be reliably calculated at high momenta and non-perturbative contributions which we parameterize (but don't calculate) by exploiting the heavy quark mass expansion. We show that the expansion of the moments of the fragmentation function at any given order in Λ/m only involves a small number of mass independent parameters. Because the same parameters enter the b and c quark fragmentation functions and moments of different order, tests of heavy quark symmetry will be possible.

The principle results of our analysis are:

- At leading twist, we find a simple parametric form for the quark mass dependence of the fragmentation and distribution functions at the heavy quark mass scale which applies at leading order in Λ/m . Our form differs from the commonly used function of Ref. [3] because our prediction for the width is order Λ/m , and not order Λ^2/m^2 . This difference is critical to extracting the scale Λ which enters the heavy quark expansion.
- We show that the moments of the fragmentation function can be interpreted in terms of mass-independent parameters. We concentrate on only a finite number of these parameters which we expect can be reliably extracted. This will allow for tests of heavy quark

symmetry. Moreover, it could provide further data on which scale Λ works best in the heavy quark expansion.

- Within our framework it is possible to make rather strong statements about those higher-twist effects proportional to powers of m^2/Q^2 , where Q^2 is the center-of-mass energy squared. Since $m \gg \Lambda$, these are the most important higher-twist corrections. We show that the sum of all corrections of order $(m^2/Q^2)^k$ to the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$ vanishes for all $k > 0$ at leading order in α_s . Radiative corrections modify this result and give rise to corrections of order $\frac{1}{\pi}\alpha_s(Q^2)\frac{m^2}{Q^2}\ln\frac{Q^2}{m^2}$. We show that these corrections can be related back to the leading twist fragmentation function. Mass suppressed corrections are of order $\Lambda m/Q^2$ and can also be related back to the leading twist fragmentation function.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we derive the leading twist results, first for distribution functions, which are pedagogically simpler, although not the case of greatest experimental interest, and then for fragmentation functions. In Section III, we investigate the applications of our approach. We conclude that a finite number of non-perturbative parameters can be reliably extracted by measuring the moments of the fragmentation function, using a simple phenomenological form whose parameters are readily interpreted in a heavy quark mass expansion. In Section IV we consider higher-twist contributions to $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$, after which we conclude.

II. HEAVY QUARK DISTRIBUTION AND FRAGMENTATION FUNCTIONS AT LEADING TWIST

II.1 Distribution Functions

Figure 1 shows the virtual Compton scattering diagram for an h quark current whose imaginary part yields the dominant contribution to a hypothetical deep inelastic scattering experiment from an H -meson target. A standard analysis of this diagram yields the distribution function for heavy quarks (h with mass m) in a heavy meson (H with mass M) in terms of a Fourier transform of a heavy quark correlation function along the null plane:⁶

$$f(x, \mu^2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\lambda e^{i\lambda x} \langle H(P) | \bar{h}(0) \not{n} h(\lambda n) | H(P) \rangle_{\mu^2} . \quad (2.1)$$

Here n^μ is a null vector defined by $P^\mu = p^\mu + M^2 n^\mu / 2$, the heavy meson momentum and p and n are defined by $p^2 = n^2 = 0$, $p \cdot n = 1$ yielding $p^\mu = p(1, 0, 0, 1)$, $n^\mu = (1/2p)(1, 0, 0, -1)$. The variable x is related to the kinematic variables of Compton scattering by $x = Q^2/2q \cdot P$. The parameter p is arbitrary and fixes the frame. For example, $p = M/2$ corresponds to the heavy meson rest frame; $p \rightarrow \infty$ is the “infinite momentum frame” often used in parton models. Here, $h(\xi)$ is the heavy quark field. Equation (2.1) is written in $n \cdot A = 0$ gauge, avoiding the need for a line integral between $\bar{h}$ and h . Also we have suppressed a factor of $n \cdot P = 1$ in the exponent. Contraction with n^μ is natural in deep inelastic processes in which some direction of hard momentum flow is specified (*e.g.* $q^\mu \cong \nu n^\mu - x p^\mu$ in deep inelastic scattering). It also selects operators of pure twist (twist-2 in this case) since traces are removed by contraction with n^μ . The mass scale μ^2 is the renormalization scale required to render the local operators in the Taylor expansion of (2.1) finite. Equivalently, μ^2 appears as a cutoff on the transverse momentum integral which arises in a momentum space representation of $f(x, \mu^2)$.

In order to apply heavy quark symmetry we should take $\mu^2 = \mu_0^2$, where μ_0 is a scale beneath the lightest of the heavy quark masses, but above the QCD scale so that perturbative QCD is still reliable. However, we will see later that to the order of accuracy we can hope to achieve, our results apply at any renormalization scale below m^2 . Thus we will eventually set $\mu_0^2 = m^2$, but for now we keep it as an independent renormalization scale. The scale m^2 is time-like whereas μ^2 is space-like. This distinction only affects terms higher order in $\alpha_s(\mu^2)$ than concern us here, so we drop it.

It is straightforward to convert $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ to a form in which its interpretation as a parton momentum distribution is more readily apparent. First, decompose h with the light-cone projection operator $P_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^\pm\gamma^\mp$ with $h_+ = P_+h$, and insert a complete set of intermediate states $\{|\chi\rangle\}$,

$$f(x, \mu_0^2) = \frac{1}{2p} \sum_\chi \delta(x - 1 + P_\chi \cdot n) |\langle \chi | h_+(0) | H(P) \rangle|^2$$

where we have suppressed reference to the renormalization scale on the right-hand side. The momentum $P_h^\mu = P^\mu - P_\chi^\mu$ is the momentum of the struck heavy quark. The function $f(x)$ measures the probability of finding a “good” light-cone component of the quark field with momentum fraction x ($p^+ = xP^+$) in the target. The physical process $eH \rightarrow eX$ also receives contributions from the heavy *antiquark* distribution in H , $\bar{f}(x, \mu^2)$, corresponding to Figure 1 with the quark line replaced by an antiquark line. It is difficult to separate $\bar{f}$ from f experimentally. The function $\bar{f}(x, \mu^2)$ is defined by the crossing relation $\bar{f}(x, \mu^2) = -f(-x, \mu^2)$ and has a parton representation like (2.2) with h_+ replaced by $h_+^\dagger$. It measures the probability of finding a heavy antiquark in the meson H . We argue below that $\bar{f}(x, \mu^2)$ is small at $\mu^2 \sim m^2$. Similarly, a potential gluon contribution is also small at $\mu^2 \sim m^2$.

We now proceed to parameterize (2.1). We first expand

$$f(x, \mu_0^2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \int d\lambda e^{i\lambda x} (-i\lambda)^k \langle H(P) | \bar{h}(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^k h(0) | H(P) \rangle \quad (2.3)$$

where $\Pi_\mu = iD_\mu$ and we have returned to a manifestly gauge invariant form. We match this matrix element of the full theory onto matrix elements in the heavy quark effective theory. We define the meson four velocity, v^μ , by $P^\mu = Mv^\mu$, where M is the meson mass. Following the standard procedure, (although we do not bother to rescale the fields, since everything will be dimensionless in the end) we decompose the field $h(\xi)$ as

$$h(\xi) = h_v(\xi) + \underline{h}_v(\xi) \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$h_v(\xi) = e^{-imv \cdot \xi} \mathcal{P}_+ h(\xi) \quad (2.5)$$

$$\underline{h}_v(\xi) = e^{-imv \cdot \xi} \mathcal{P}_- h(\xi) \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\pm = (1 \pm \not{v})/2$. Then

$$\Pi_\mu h(\xi) = e^{-imv \cdot \xi} (mv_\mu + \Pi_\mu) (\mathcal{P}_+ h(\xi) + \mathcal{P}_- h(\xi)) \quad (2.7)$$

We now match the matrix element which appears in (2.3),

$$\Gamma_k = \langle H(P) | \bar{h}(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^k h(0) | H(P) \rangle \quad (2.8)$$

onto a sum of matrix elements of the heavy quark effective theory. Clearly, these matrix elements can be organized as a power series in $1/m$. The leading term is the term in which the momentum is mv_μ and the matrix element is taken between the fields h_v . Mass suppression

factors in the remaining matrix elements derive from several sources. First, in the derivative in (2.7), the first term is $mv_\mu h_v(\xi) = \frac{m}{M} P_\mu h_v(\xi)$, while the second (mass suppressed) term is $\Pi_\mu h_v(\xi) \approx \epsilon P_\mu h_v(\xi)$ where $\epsilon \approx 1 - \frac{m}{M} \equiv \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{M}$. Second, because the equation of motion yields $\underline{h}_v(\xi) = (1/2m)\Pi^\alpha \gamma_\alpha h_v(\xi)$, the matrix elements involving $\underline{h}_v(\xi)$ are mass suppressed relative to matrix elements of the same operator with $h_v(\xi)$ instead. Finally, matrix elements involving the time-ordered product of the operator with mass suppressed operators, $\mathcal{O}_{1/m}$, in the heavy quark Lagrangian also yield mass suppression. With these considerations in mind, we substitute (2.7) into (2.8) and organize the expansion according to the powers of $1/m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_k = \sum_{\ell} \Bigg\{ & \binom{k}{\ell} (n \cdot mv)^\ell \left\langle H(P) \left| \bar{h}_v(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^{k-\ell} h_v(0) \right| H(P) \right\rangle \\ & + \binom{k}{\ell+1} (n \cdot mv)^{\ell+1} \left[\left\langle H(P) \left| \bar{h}_v(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^{k-\ell-1} h_v(0) \right| H(P) \right\rangle \right. \\ & + \left\langle H(P) \left| \bar{h}_v(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^{k-\ell-1} \underline{h}_v(0) \right| H(P) \right\rangle \\ & \left. + \left\langle H(P) \left| T \left(\mathcal{O}_{1/m} \bar{h}_v(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^{k-\ell-1} h_v(0) \right) \right| H(P) \right\rangle \right] + \dots \Bigg\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where $\dots$ represents terms multiplying $\binom{k}{\ell+n}$, $n > 1$. In (2.9), $\binom{k}{\ell}$ is the binomial coefficient defined to be zero for $\ell < 0$ or $\ell > k$. The range of the sum on ℓ is then dictated by the values for which $\binom{k}{\ell} \neq 0$. The first term has the largest binomial coefficient and comes from terms in which all the mass suppression factors come from the small momentum piece of Π_μ . In the second term, one power of mass suppression has a different origin. The $\dots$ represents terms with even smaller binomial coefficient, which begin at order $1/m^2$.

We now rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} M_k = 2 \sum_{\ell} & \binom{k}{\ell} (n \cdot mv)^\ell \epsilon^{k-\ell} A_{k-\ell} \\ & + \binom{k}{\ell+1} (n \cdot mv)^{\ell+1} \epsilon^{k-\ell} B_{k-\ell} \\ & + \binom{k}{\ell+2} (n \cdot mv)^{\ell+2} \epsilon^{k-\ell} C_{k-\ell} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\left\langle H(P) \left| \bar{h}_v(0) n_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (n \cdot \Pi)^k h_v(0) \right| H(P) \right\rangle = 2A_k \epsilon^k \quad (2.11)$$

and similarly for B and C , defined in terms of the sum of matrix elements multiplying a particular binomial coefficient. * All dependence on the heavy quark mass is contained in the factors ϵ^p provided ϵ scales inversely to the heavy meson mass. We make the specific choice $\epsilon = \bar{\Lambda}/M = 1 - m/M$ which simplifies the algebra. Notice that ϵ scales like the inverse heavy *meson* mass because $n \cdot P = 1$. To get the heavy *quark* mass expansion in the end requires expanding the meson mass M in terms of the quark mass m . Furthermore, because the heavy quark occurs in the functions $B, C, \dots$, one must be careful to expand the mass factor here in terms of the meson mass for consistency. With only the functions A, B , and C , the expansion above is sufficient.

Having extracted the factors of ϵ , the parameters A, B and C are independent of the heavy quark mass. Here, $A_0 = 1$ because $\bar{h} \not{n} h$ counts heavy quarks minus antiquarks in the H -meson.

At this point, we wish to exploit the fact that the same matrix elements appear in all the Γ_k . We will first add the terms into a general function incorporating this fact. Following this, we will derive relations among moments. It is useful to define functions $a(y), b(y)$, *etc.* whose moments give the A_k, B_k , *etc.* We define

$$A_k = \int_{-\infty}^1 dy a(y) y^k \quad (2.12)$$

$$B_{k+1} = \int_{-\infty}^1 dy b(y) y^k \quad (2.13)$$

* Although order ϵ terms can be shown to vanish, this will not be the case for the fragmentation function. We simply leave in all the terms here.

The limits on the y -integration are chosen to reproduce the required support of the structure function ($0 < x \leq 1$). Note that $a(y)$ and $b(y)$ must fall rapidly as $y \rightarrow -\infty$ in order that (2.12) and (2.13) converge. The exact nature of this requirement and its physical significance will be further discussed below. The upper limit is unity due to our choice of ϵ . So long as ϵ scales like $1/M$ the upper limit is mass independent. We now have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_k &= 2 \sum_{\ell} \int_{-\infty}^1 dy \left[\binom{k}{\ell} \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\ell} (\epsilon y)^{k-\ell} a(y) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \binom{k}{\ell+1} \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\ell+1} \epsilon (\epsilon y)^{k-\ell-1} b(y) + \dots \right] \\ &= 2 \int_{-\infty}^1 dy \left[\left(\frac{m}{M} + \epsilon y\right)^k a(y) + \epsilon \left(\frac{m}{M} + \epsilon y\right)^k b(y) + \dots \right]\end{aligned}\tag{2.14}$$

where we have used $n \cdot mv = m/M$. We can now substitute Γ_k into (2.3) to obtain

$$f(x, \mu_0^2) = \sum_k \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^1 dy e^{i\lambda x} \frac{1}{k!} (-i\lambda)^k \left(\frac{m}{M} + \epsilon y\right)^k (a(y) + \epsilon b(y) + \dots) \tag{2.15}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^1 dy \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda e^{i\lambda(x - m/M - \epsilon y)} (a(y) + \epsilon b(y) + \dots) \tag{2.16}$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^1 \delta(x - m/M - \epsilon y) (a(y) + \epsilon b(y) + \dots) \tag{2.17}$$

$$f(x, \mu_0^2) = \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} a\left(\frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon}\right) + b\left(\frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon}\right) + \dots \right] \tag{2.18}$$

Equation (2.18) is the result from which our conclusions about the heavy quark distribution function follow. It expresses the fact that $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ can be expanded in a power series in $\epsilon = \bar{\Lambda}/M$. At any order in ϵ , there is a single function. However, the argument of that function,

$$y = \frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon} = \frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{1 - \frac{m}{M}} , \tag{2.19}$$

depends in a rather singular way upon ϵ .

The derivation of (2.18) suggests that it holds only if the functions $a(y)$, $b(y)$, *etc.* fall faster than any power of y as $y \rightarrow -\infty$ as indicated by (2.12) and (2.13). In fact this assumption is stronger than is required. It was convenient for us to expand the distribution function in terms of local operators and then resum into $f(x)$. Had we instead matched directly onto the bilocal operator product of (2.1), we would have achieved (2.18) directly without any requirement that *all* of the A_k , B_k , *etc.* exist. The steps in such a derivation are straightforward, so we summarize them very briefly here. First, perform the matching summarized by (2.5) and (2.6) directly in (2.1). The result is

$$f(x, \mu^2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\lambda e^{i\lambda x} \langle H(P) | \overline{\mathcal{P}_+ h}(0) \not{n} \mathcal{P}_+ h(\lambda n) | H(P) \rangle e^{-im\lambda v \cdot n} + \dots, \quad (2.20)$$

where we have kept only the term which will eventually turn into $a(y)$ and $\dots$ denotes all other terms. Eq.(2.20) remains in $n \cdot A = 0$ gauge (but can be made gauge invariant by restoring the line integral) and we suppress the renormalization scale μ^2 . The matrix element in (2.20) is dimensionless, remembering the dimension of n_μ , so converting to the normalization of the heavy quark theory it turns into a dimensionless function of the variable $\lambda \frac{\Lambda}{M}$,

$$\langle H(P) | \overline{\mathcal{P}_+ h}(0) \not{n} \mathcal{P}_+ h(\lambda n) | H(P) \rangle = \mathcal{F} \left(\lambda \frac{\Lambda}{M} \right), \quad (2.21)$$

which we represent as a Fourier transform,

$$\mathcal{F} \left(\lambda \frac{\Lambda}{M} \right) = 2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\alpha e^{-i\alpha \lambda \frac{\Lambda}{M}} a(\alpha). \quad (2.22)$$

It is then a simple matter to substitute this Fourier representation into (2.20) and obtain (2.18). It is clear from this derivation that we do not yet need to make any assumptions about the behavior of $a(y)$ as $y \rightarrow \pm\infty$ in order to obtain (2.18).

With this second derivation of (2.18) in hand we can examine the behavior of $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ near the kinematic limits $x = 0$ and $x = 1$. The distribution function $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ must vanish for $x > 1$ since there are no physical intermediate states in this range. The natural constraint $a(1) = b(1) = \dots 0$ suffices to guarantee that $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ vanishes at $x = 1$ independent of ϵ .

The function $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ need not vanish for $x < 0$ – for negative values of x , it is related to $\bar{f}(-x, \mu_0^2)$. However, the limit $x \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to $y \rightarrow -1/\epsilon$ in (2.19) and this is a physically interesting limit from the perspective of the heavy quark expansion. By comparing the arguments of the δ -functions in (2.17) and (2.2), we see that $x \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to spectators (light quarks and glue) with momentum $P_\chi^\mu \sim mv^\mu$, since $P_\chi \cdot n = \epsilon(1 - y)$. Since spectators with momenta of order mv^μ are not allowed within the framework of the heavy quark effective theory, we cannot study the $x \rightarrow 0$ limit in the context of the heavy quark expansion. However, we can conclude on the physical basis of the heavy quark expansion that the functions $a(y)$, $b(y)$, *etc.* vanish rapidly as $y \rightarrow -\infty$. Any more detailed statement is beyond the scope of the heavy quark effective theory.

In the following section, we will describe a formulation of the heavy quark expansion in which the parameters A_k , B_k , *etc.* play a central role. The assumption that these coefficients exist up to some index k_{max} requires that the functions $a(y)$, $b(y)$, *etc.* vanish faster than y^{-k-1} , y^{-k} , *etc.*, respectively, as $y \rightarrow -\infty$. If $a(y)$, $b(y)$, *etc.* vanish faster than any power of y in this limit, then of course, the A_k , B_k , *etc.* exist for all k . If they vanish only like some power, then the parameters A_k , B_k , *etc.* exist up to some k_{max} . We cannot determine k_{max} from the heavy quark expansion; we take it to be a parameter of our analysis on which we comment when appropriate.

Since all mass dependent factors have been scaled out of A_k , B_k *etc.*, these should all be of order unity. In fact, in free field theory all the A_k would equal unity and $a(y)$ would

be a δ -function at $y = 1$, corresponding to $P_\chi^\mu = 0$, in (2.2) (*i.e.* no spectators). In the real world the heavy quark is not free and $a(y)$ is not a δ -function. However, since $a(1) = 0$ and $a(y) \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow -\infty$, it is clear that (2.18) describes a function, $f(x, \mu_0^2)$, which is sharply peaked near $x = m/M \approx 1 - \epsilon$ and whose width is of order ϵ . In fact, since $A_0 = 1$, $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ approaches a δ -function as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, reproducing free field theory in this limit as it should. It is important to appreciate the fact that $a(y)$ provides a heavy-quark-mass independent measure of the influence of confinement on the heavy quark momentum distribution in a heavy meson — a fact which could provide tests of the heavy quark expansion. This will be discussed below.

Equation (2.18) gives $f(x, \mu_0^2)$ at the heavy quark mass scale. Experiments will generally be done at a value of momentum squared, Q^2 , higher than this. What we have computed so far is simply the “boundary data” for QCD evolution from a low mass scale to the scale Q^2 . This evolution is non-trivial and complicates the comparison of (2.18) with experiment. We postpone the important discussion of comparison with experiment until we have considered the fragmentation function.

II.2 Fragmentation Function

The analysis is very similar to that of the previous section. We first define the heavy quark fragmentation function as the leading twist contribution of the heavy quark to the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$ where $H(P)$ is a stable meson with four-momentum P_μ containing the heavy quark h and X is any additional hadronic contribution to the final state. We first give the analog of (2.1) for the spin averaged fragmentation function.⁷

$$\hat{f}(x, \mu^2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_\chi \int d\lambda e^{i\lambda x} \langle 0 | n_\alpha \gamma_{ij}^\alpha h_j(\lambda n) | H(P) \chi \rangle \langle H(P) \chi | \bar{h}_i(0) | 0 \rangle \quad (2.23)$$

where we have explicitly incorporated the Lorentz indices. As before, we suppress μ^2 on the right-hand side and assume $n \cdot A = 0$ gauge. Here, because we cannot perform the sum on χ , the relevant product of matrix elements does not reduce to a bilocal operator. As with the structure function, the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$ also receives a contribution from $\hat{f}(x, \mu^2)$ which measures anti- h -quark fragmentation into H plus anything. This should be negligible for $\mu^2 \sim m^2$. For now, we retain the variable $x = Q^2/2P \cdot Q$ ($1 < x < \infty$), which in the center of mass frame is the ratio of the beam energy to the energy of the hadron. With this variable, $\hat{f}(x, Q^2)$ can be interpreted as the probability of finding a hadron of momentum fraction $1/x$ when a quark of unit momentum is created from the vacuum by a current of virtuality Q^2 . As before, this can be seen by translating $h(\lambda n)$ to $h(0)$ and using light cone projection operators,

$$\hat{f}(x, \mu^2) = \frac{1}{2p} \sum_{\chi} \delta(x - 1 - P_{\chi} \cdot n) \left| \left\langle H(P) \chi \left| h_+^{\dagger}(0) \right| 0 \right\rangle \right|^2 . \quad (2.24)$$

The evaluation of $\hat{f}(x, \mu^2)$ proceeds similarly to that of $f(x, \mu^2)$. Here we define

$$\sum_{\chi} \langle 0 | n_{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha} (n \cdot \Pi)^k h_v(0) | H(P) \chi \rangle \langle H(P) \chi | \bar{h}_v(0) | 0 \rangle = 2\epsilon^k A_k \quad (2.25)$$

and similarly for the subleading terms. We also define functions $\hat{a}(y)$ and $\hat{b}(y)$ by

$$\hat{A}_k = \int_1^{\infty} dy y^k \hat{a}(y) , \quad \hat{B}_{k+1} = \int_1^{\infty} dy y^k \hat{b}(y) , \quad (2.26)$$

etc.

The range of $\hat{a}(y)$ has been chosen so that the fragmentation function will only be non-zero in the physical region, $1 \leq x < \infty$. Following an identical analysis to that for the structure function, we derive

$$\hat{f}(x, \mu_0^2) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \hat{a} \left(\frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon} \right) + \hat{b} \left(\frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon} \right) + \dots \quad (2.27)$$

where $\hat{b}$ is the subleading term defined analogously to the previous section and $\dots$ refers to further suppressed functions. With the more conventional definition of the fragmentation function variable, $z = 1/x$, one obtains

$$\hat{f}\left(\frac{1}{z}, \mu_0^2\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \hat{a}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{z} - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon}\right) + \hat{b}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{z} - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon}\right) + \dots \quad (2.28)$$

Here z is the fraction of the beam energy carried by the hadron.

Equation (2.28) summarizes the predictions of the heavy quark expansion for the fragmentation function at the heavy quark mass scale μ_0^2 . As in the case of the distribution function, the derivation seems to require the existence of all the parameters $\hat{A}_k$, $\hat{B}_k$, *etc.*. However, as before, there is an alternate derivation which deals directly with the (2.23) without ever expanding in local operators. The result is the same, (2.28), without the restriction that the integrals defined in (2.26) exist. All of the remarks made in the previous section concerning the $x \rightarrow 0$ or $y \rightarrow -\infty$ limit apply as well to the fragmentation function in the $z \rightarrow 0$ or $y \rightarrow \infty$ limit. We shall generally assume that the parameters $\hat{A}_k$, $\hat{B}_k$, *etc.* exist for k up to some k_{max} . To fit the parameters, (2.28) must be evolved to a scale $Q^2 > \mu_0^2$. We therefore discuss QCD evolution in the next section.

III. EVOLUTION, LIMITATIONS OF THE HEAVY QUARK EXPANSION AND COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

III.1 Moment Analysis

We have obtained the general form for the fragmentation function at a low renormalization scale. Because the fragmentation function is measured at $Q^2 \gg m^2$, it is necessary to discuss the QCD evolution between the two scales. This is most conveniently accomplished by evolving the measured moments of the fragmentation function to the scale μ_0^2 at which we have parameterized the function. At this scale, one extracts the mass independent parameters.

In this subsection, we will discuss the application of this procedure to the first few moments of the fragmentation function. In later subsections, we explain why we restrict our analysis to only these lowest moments. We parameterize these moments in terms of mass independent parameters (related to those which entered the functions $\hat{a}(y)$ and $\hat{b}(y)$) and show furthermore how to extract the parameters characterizing the moments at leading and subleading order in Λ/m .

We define the moments of the fragmentation function at a scale Q^2 above the heavy quark scale in the usual way.

$$\hat{\Gamma}_k(Q^2) = \int_0^1 dz z^k \hat{f}\left(\frac{1}{z}, Q^2\right) . \quad (3.1)$$

Notice we study the moments in z for positive k . These are the conventional moments: they scale simply under QCD evolution and are convergent at all scales Q^2 . Having defined the moments at the scale Q^2 , one must renormalize them from Q^2 to the scale μ_0^2 , where we have parameterized the matrix elements. This proceeds in three steps. First, one must evolve the function from the high momentum scale Q^2 at which the experiment takes place to the heavy

quark mass scale m^2 . Then one must match the evolved moments onto the heavy quark theory. Finally, one must evolve in the heavy quark theory from the scale m^2 to the scale μ_0^2 at which the matrix elements were parameterized. To apply heavy quark flavor symmetry, this scale should be the same for the b and c quarks.

The first stage of evolution, between Q^2 and m^2 , is standard. The fragmentation function measured in $e^+e^- \rightarrow H + X$ at the large scale Q^2 is a linear combination of quark, antiquark and gluon fragmentation functions. The gluon and antiquark fragmentation functions are not zero at the scale Q^2 . However, they evolved from the scale m^2 at which both the antiquark and gluon fragmentation functions were negligible. In particular, because the quark is heavy, the gluon moments at the scale m^2 are suppressed by $(\Lambda/m)^2$ relative to the quark contribution. With these constraints on the antiquark and gluon fragmentation functions it is possible to de-evolve the data from Q^2 using the standard anomalous dimension matrix and obtain the heavy quark fragmentation function at the scale m^2 . Above the heavy quark mass scale, the fact that the quark is heavy is irrelevant to the evolution equations, and enters only in the boundary condition which tells us the gluon moments are small at the scale m^2 . This information about the boundary data, together with the experimental data at the scale Q^2 , is sufficient to solve completely the evolution equations.

The second stage in the procedure is to match from the full theory onto the heavy quark theory. From the definition of the fragmentation function given in (2.23), it is clear that the moments match onto the moments in the heavy quark theory in a straightforward way. That is, we already know how to match the matrix elements appearing in the function itself onto matrix elements of the heavy quark effective theory characterized by the parameters $\hat{A}_k, \hat{B}_k, \dots$ which we have defined. The moments are defined as integrals of $\hat{f}(x, \mu_0^2)$ times

powers of x . This definition holds in both the full and effective theories. If one were to work to subleading order, there would be additional contributions from evaluating the one loop matrix elements in the full theory.

The final stage is to de-evolve the moments in the heavy quark effective theory from the heavy quark mass scale, m^2 , to the uniform scale of the effective theory, μ_0^2 . Fortunately, to leading and sub-leading order in ϵ , this is trivial. The point is that the matrix elements at leading and subleading order in the heavy quark mass expansion *do not evolve*. This is most easily seen in $v \cdot A = 0$ gauge where v_μ is the heavy meson velocity. Because the parameters $\hat{A}_k$ and $\hat{B}_k$ are defined in terms of matrix elements of local, gauge-invariant operators in the effective theory which involve only a single velocity v_μ , the gluons do not couple in leading order in the heavy quark mass expansion. Of course, at the level of $1/m^2$, there are QCD radiative corrections in the heavy quark effective theory. Therefore, in order to extract parameters at order ϵ^2 further QCD evolution would be necessary.

To summarize, the moments of the heavy quark fragmentation function should be determined experimentally from the data at the scale Q^2 . They should then be de-evolved via QCD evolution down to the scale m^2 , at which point they should be matched to the moments of the function $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ parameterized in the heavy quark effective theory through the parameters $\hat{A}_k$ and $\hat{B}_k$, or equivalently, the functions $\hat{a}(y)$ and $\hat{b}(y)$ which summarize the relations among the moments. The QCD radiative corrections in the full theory are given in Ref. [5] to subleading order. For the leading parameters no further QCD evolution in the heavy quark effective theory is required.

For simplicity, we therefore compare the evolved, experimentally determined moments at $\mu^2 = m^2$ to the moments derived from the function (2.23). It is more convenient to work

with the variable x to which we now revert. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Gamma}_k(m^2) &= \int_1^\infty dx x^{-k-2} \hat{f}(x, m^2) \\ &= \int_1^\infty dx x^{-k-2} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \hat{a} \left(\frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon} \right) + \hat{b} \left(\frac{x - \frac{m}{M}}{\epsilon} \right) + \dots \right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

A simple change of variables yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Gamma}_k(m^2) &= \int_1^\infty dy \left(\epsilon y + \frac{m}{M} \right)^{-k-2} (a(y) + \epsilon b(y) + \dots) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty \binom{-k-2}{\ell} \left\{ \epsilon^\ell \tilde{A}_\ell + \epsilon^{\ell+1} \tilde{B}_{\ell+1} + \dots \right\}\end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

where we have shown explicitly only those functions which begin at order ϵ^0 or order ϵ . Here

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{A}_\ell &\equiv \int_1^\infty dy (y-1)^\ell a(y) \\ \tilde{B}_{\ell+1} &\equiv \int_1^\infty dy (y-1)^\ell b(y).\end{aligned}\tag{3.6}$$

Notice that only a finite number of $\tilde{A}_\ell$, $\tilde{B}_\ell$, *etc.* occur in the expansion of any given moment to a fixed order in ϵ .

Consider now the explicit expressions for the first few moments.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Gamma}_0(m^2) &= \tilde{A}_0 + \epsilon \left(-2\tilde{A}_1 + \tilde{B}_1 \right) + \epsilon^2 (3\tilde{A}_2 - 2\tilde{B}_2 + \tilde{C}_2) + \dots \\ \hat{\Gamma}_1(m^2) &= \tilde{A}_0 + \epsilon \left(-3\tilde{A}_1 + \tilde{B}_1 \right) + \epsilon^2 \left(6\tilde{A}_2 - 3\tilde{B}_2 + \tilde{C}_2 \right) + \dots \\ \hat{\Gamma}_2(m^2) &= \tilde{A}_0 + \epsilon \left(-4\tilde{A}_1 + \tilde{B}_1 \right) + \epsilon^2 \left(10\tilde{A}_2 - 4\tilde{B}_2 + \tilde{C}_2 \right) + \dots \\ \hat{\Gamma}_3(m^2) &= \tilde{A}_0 + \epsilon \left(-5\tilde{A}_1 + \tilde{B}_1 \right) + \epsilon^2 \left(15\tilde{A}_2 - 5\tilde{B}_2 + \tilde{C}_2 \right) + \dots\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

If we work to order ϵ and require the remainders in (3.7) to be bounded, then it is necessary to assume that $a(y)$ vanishes faster than y^{-3} for large y . Likewise $b(y)$ must vanish faster than y^{-2} . In order to work to order ϵ^2 , $a(y)$ and $b(y)$ must vanish one power faster for large y . Assuming these asymptotic forms, and that the heavy quark expansion is valid, we can

extract the leading parameters of the functions $\hat{a}(y)$ and $\hat{b}(y)$. In particular, from knowledge of either the b or c quark fragmentation function alone, one can extract the parameters $\tilde{A}_0 + \epsilon \tilde{B}_1 + \epsilon^2 \tilde{C}_2 + \dots \approx \tilde{A}_0$, $\epsilon \tilde{A}_1 - \epsilon^2 \tilde{B}_2 + \dots \approx \epsilon \tilde{A}_1$, and $\epsilon^2 \tilde{A}_2$, working only to order ϵ^2 . With knowledge of both the c and b quark fragmentation functions, one can independently extract $\tilde{A}_0$, $\epsilon \tilde{B}_1$, $\epsilon \tilde{A}_1$, $\epsilon^2 \tilde{B}_2$, and $\epsilon^2 \tilde{A}_2$. Of course if we work only at order ϵ , there is an equal spacing rule which serves as a consistency check on the moments:

$$\hat{\Gamma}_1 - \hat{\Gamma}_0 = \hat{\Gamma}_2 - \hat{\Gamma}_1 = \hat{\Gamma}_3 - \hat{\Gamma}_2 \quad . \quad (3.8)$$

We can now also see the main problem with extracting information from higher moments. In order to extract a parameter at any specified order in the heavy quark mass expansion, we need to assume that higher order terms can be neglected. However, the large binomial coefficients multiplying higher order terms in ϵ make this impossible for the higher moments. That is, for the k th moment, with k large, the expansion is not in ϵ , but in $k\epsilon$, which compromises the application of the expansion beyond the lowest moments. In the next subsection, we discuss the further advantages to be had by restricting attention to only the lowest moments. After that (in III.4), we return to the question of whether information can be extracted from the higher moments, or equivalently from the function $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ itself.

III.2 Subleading QCD Evolution

We have discussed leading logarithmic QCD evolution. However, it is well known that the usual QCD evolution program has difficulties with heavy quark fragmentation functions. In this section, we explain why these problems are less severe for our program than for a fully perturbative study of heavy quark fragmentation functions and may be ignored entirely if we restrict our analysis to the lowest moments.

In principle, one would expect that QCD evolution in the full theory between Q^2 and m^2 is perturbative, as both scales are much higher than the QCD scale. However, near $x = 1$, the QCD coupling α_s is multiplied by logarithms of the form $\log(1 - x)$, etc. In this region, effects which are formally subleading are nevertheless large. In fact, it has been shown that the summation of these Sudakov logarithms can be summarized by evaluating α_s at the scale $(1 - x)Q^2$.⁸ These effects are important when $(1 - x)Q^2 \ll Q^2$ and furthermore the analysis suggests that other, truly non-perturbative effects cannot be neglected for x such that $(1 - x)Q^2 \sim \Lambda^2$.

Now consider the form of the function renormalized at m^2 given by (2.28). It vanishes at $x = 1$ and is peaked at $x - 1 \sim \epsilon$. Sudakov effects are worst at the lowest Q^2 , in this case $Q^2 = m^2$. At $Q^2 = m^2$, non-perturbative effects beyond the resummation of Sudakov logarithms are important for $1 - x < \epsilon^2$. The distinction between ϵ and ϵ^2 is crucial. Since $\hat{f}$ is likely to be a rapidly falling function in the region close to $x = 1$, and since the scale for variation in $\hat{f}$ is ϵ , the function should be very small in the region where Sudakov logarithms are important. In particular, the first few moments are very likely dominated by x in the regime where even Sudakov logarithms are not large, so a leading logarithmic analysis should be valid. However, we do not know how fast $\hat{f}$ falls as $x \rightarrow 1$. This non-perturbative information determines which moments are trustworthy. Since constraints on the heavy quark expansion most likely restricts us more severely to low moments than do considerations of Sudakov effects, we expect that Sudakov logs can be neglected altogether.

This is in contrast to previous works^{4,5} which attempted a fully perturbative analysis of the fragmentation function over the whole range of x . They have been led to a form of the fragmentation function which is singular at $x = 1$ and have necessarily had to deal with

evolution in a regime in which non-perturbative effects are important. From this perspective, our approach has been to summarize the nonperturbative information in a few parameters. With sufficiently rough averaging (by looking only at low moments) we can then do a simpler QCD analysis.

We see now the essential advantage gained by restricting attention only to the lowest moments, independent of the breakdown of the ϵ expansion. Our objective is to cleanly distinguish perturbative and non-perturbative QCD. For x very close to 1, this distinction is not possible. But this region of x should not contribute significantly to the low moments for the reasons outlined above.

Having addressed the issue of Sudakov logarithms, the study of higher order QCD effects should be standard. For example, there is an ambiguity associated with the precise scale at which we match between the full and heavy quark effective theories which can only be resolved through a higher order QCD calculation. Moreover, as a matter of practice, the data on the c quark is obtained at center of mass energy of the $\Upsilon(4S)$. Furthermore, it might be that in this case the logarithm is not sufficiently large for a leading log analysis to be adequate. Certainly, a subleading calculation would be required to extract a parameter at the precision of ϵ^2 .

III.4 Direct Analysis of $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$

Having analysed the limitations on the moment analysis, we return briefly to the possibility of extracting information from looking directly at the function $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$. As long as we restrict $(1 - x) \gg \epsilon^2$ Sudakov effects are not likely to be important. Looking at (3.7) we see that the moment analysis breaks down when $k\epsilon > 1$. However, the terms which become large in this limit can be resummed yielding the original functional form, (2.28), in which

successive terms are suppressed by powers of ϵ when the argument, $y = (\frac{1}{z} - \frac{m}{M})/\epsilon$, is held fixed. So it is appropriate to analyze $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ directly.

First, suppose the function $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ can be extracted from experiment and QCD de-evolution. The predictive power of (2.28) lies in the orderly expansion in ϵ implied for $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ when $x = 1 + \epsilon(y - 1)$,

$$\hat{f}(1 + \epsilon(y - 1), m^2) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \hat{a}(y) + \hat{b}(y) + \dots \quad (3.9)$$

where $\hat{a}(y)$, $\hat{b}(y)$, *etc.* are all independent of ϵ . In principle, $\hat{f}$ can be measured for both c - and b -quarks, $\hat{a}(y)$, $\hat{b}(y)$ and ϵ can all be extracted and the heavy quark expansion can be tested. To leading order in ϵ , (2.28) requires that there is a choice of $\bar{\Lambda}$ (which in principle could have been extracted elsewhere¹⁰) such that

$$\epsilon_c \hat{f}_c(1 + \epsilon_c(y - 1), m_c^2) - \epsilon_b \hat{f}_b(1 + \epsilon_b(y - 1), m_b^2) = 0 \quad (3.10)$$

Having fixed ϵ_c and ϵ_b , $\hat{a}(y)$ can be extracted from

$$\hat{a}(y) = \frac{\epsilon_c \epsilon_b}{\epsilon_c - \epsilon_b} \left(\hat{f}_b(1 + \epsilon_b(1 - y), m_b^2) - \hat{f}_c(1 + \epsilon_c(1 - y), m_c^2) \right) \quad (3.11)$$

A cautionary note is appropriate: After de-evolution $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ would likely be available only with some finite resolution (smearing) considerably greater than the original experimental resolution at Q^2 . If the resolution were as large as the intrinsic width of $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$, which is of order ϵ , then it is easy to see that this method loses its usefulness and the moment method outlined previously gives as much information as can be extracted from the data.

III.3 Discussion

There are several points we have neglected in the previous analysis which we now clarify. First, we have made assumptions about the behavior of the heavy quark and antiquark

distributions at the heavy quark mass scale. In particular, we assumed $\hat{f}(x, m^2)$ vanishes rapidly as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and we have ignored $\hat{\bar{f}}(x, m^2)$. These assumptions are only sensible if they are stable under perturbative QCD evolution in the heavy quark theory. They would clearly not be consistent above the heavy quark scale, at which point conventional evolution generates a tail in $\hat{f}$ which reaches to $z = 0$, a gluon distribution at order $\alpha_s \ln(Q^2/m^2)$, and a heavy antiquark distribution $\hat{\bar{f}}$ at order $\alpha_s^2 \ln^2(Q^2/m^2)$. Thus it would not be reasonable to implement such assumptions in the domain of perturbative evolution. However, we are placing these restrictions on the *boundary data* at and below the heavy quark mass scale, m^2 . As we have already discussed, the structure function does not evolve at scales below m^2 at leading or subleading order in the heavy quark mass expansion. At this level of accuracy, our assumptions are therefore stable with respect to perturbative QCD evolution.

We have also neglected gluon and antiquark contributions to the moments at the scale m^2 . Because a gauge invariant gluon operator matrix element is suppressed by at least ϵ^2 and receives no enhancement by a binomial coefficient relative to the leading and subleading terms, it can only contribute to the function $c(y)$ and other suppressed functions. At the level in the heavy quark expansion at which we are working, we can neglect the gluon moments at the scale m^2 . However, as we have discussed, gluon moments are generated through perturbative QCD evolution so they do not vanish at the scale Q^2 . Similarly, antiquark moments are only generated through QCD evolution.

The next point to clarify is that throughout our analysis, we have assumed fragmentation into a specific final state, namely the pseudoscalar meson. However, experiments at very high center of mass energy will not distinguish the pseudoscalar and vector B mesons. Furthermore, the final state could be a B_s meson or a baryon containing a b quark. However, the fragmentation function into D^* is what is best measured at CESR.

If we are to apply our methods to compare the fragmentation function at LEP and CESR, we would not expect to obtain results which are accurate to better than order 20%. This is because heavy quark symmetry only guarantees the identity of the matrix elements between the pseudoscalar or the vector states at zeroth order in $1/m$. This means that the parameter $\epsilon\tilde{B}_1$ is not identical for the pseudoscalar and vector mesons. However, counting spins shows that the vector states are produced three times as often as the pseudoscalar. So even if the time ordered product of the spin splitting operator and the zeroth order matrix element accounted for 50% of the contribution to $\epsilon\tilde{B}_1$, the relations between the B system and the D system (namely the vector states) should be accurate at the 15 to 20 % level, which is the inaccuracy represented by higher order terms in the heavy quark expansion. (The mass splitting between the pseudoscalar and meson masses is higher order, and can be safely neglected.)

B_s production should also not be a problem at this order of accuracy. The B_s is only produced about 12 % of the time, and chiral symmetry should guarantee that the matrix elements are equal to those of the B_d at the 20% level.

Finally, baryons will probably be produced about 10% of the time. This can be a problem since the parameters of the baryons are independent of those of the mesons. The danger is that an inaccurate determination of $\tilde{A}_0$ would lead to a large error in extracting $\epsilon\tilde{A}_1$ and $\epsilon\tilde{B}_1$. However, there is only a single new parameter at the level of accuracy of our calculation, namely the fraction of baryons, p (since $p\epsilon$ is already only a few percent.). If a guess of p at about 10% is accurate at the few percent level, one should still be able to extract the same parameters as before. If p is left a completely free parameter, $\epsilon\tilde{B}_1$ can still be extracted. And of course if the baryons can be excluded from the sample, everything would proceed as in the text. In fact, the same analysis would apply to baryons as to mesons.

Furthermore, if it is possible to study D mesons without restricting oneself to D^* 's, but instead sums inclusively over all states, the relative fraction of mesons and baryons should be independent of heavy quark mass at leading order in the heavy quark mass expansion, so that the parameter p need not be extracted. The analysis we gave would apply, but with each parameter in the moment expansion interpreted as a sum of a meson and baryon contribution.

It should be kept in mind that the consistency tests among the moments of any particular flavor quark should hold even with different final state particles, since they only required the existence of a heavy quark expansion, which is true for each final states individually. It is only when comparing between different heavy quark systems with different fractions of the various final states that complications arise, unless one can identify the contributions from the particular final states.

Notice also that we have expanded in ϵ , which scales inversely to the meson mass so the expansion is not strictly in heavy quark mass. It is straightforward to convert our results to an expansion in heavy quark mass.

Of course, there are potential experimental difficulties which we expect could make an analysis beyond the level of ϵ impracticable. In particular, finite experimental resolution could be a problem. The spread of the measured fragmentation function of the b is increased significantly by the perturbative QCD contribution. The measurement has to be sufficiently accurate to determine the nonperturbative parameters once the perturbative contribution has been removed. Furthermore, what is measured is the hard lepton in the final state. With no further theoretical input one needs an accurate relationship between the momentum of this lepton and the momentum of the meson itself in order to accurately measure the fragmentation function. This requires good measurements of the decay lepton spectrum from B decay.

Alternatively, one would require a large sample of fully reconstructed events. However with the heavy quark expansion one could determine the lepton energy distribution, thereby simplifying the analysis.

Finally, we comment on the commonly used Peterson fragmentation function. It is clear from any analysis of heavy quark fragmentation functions that one expects a function which is weighted towards 1 but with some spread, and which goes to zero at $z = 0$ and $z = 1$. Any function of this sort will more or less fit the data. So the Peterson function is as good as any other. However, the Peterson function assigns a width of order ϵ^2 , where we have seen the true width of the fragmentation function is order ϵ . Therefore, one must be careful in assigning a physical interpretation to the parameters of the fragmentation function, or in trying to relate the fragmentation functions for different flavors of quark.

IV. CALCULABLE HIGHER-TWIST CORRECTIONS

We now turn to the subject of higher-twist corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$. In general, the study of higher-twist effects is theoretically complicated and experimentally difficult. In this case, however, the heavy quark mass sets the scale for higher-twist effects which are potentially the most important because they are of order m^2/Q^2 which in certain experiments can be large (*e.g.* $m_b \cong 5$ GeV, $Q \cong 15$ GeV gives $m^2/Q^2 \gtrsim 10\%$). Fortunately they can be related to the leading twist fragmentation function. Because the subject is technically complicated, we first summarize our results for the reader who does not wish to see the derivations. We next give a simple, non-technical derivation of the primary results. Finally we summarize the results of a complete, operator-product expansion through twist-four ($\mathcal{O}(1/Q^2)$) distribution functions which will be published elsewhere.¹⁰

First, our conclusions: At leading order in α_s , we show that there are no power corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$ which scale by the heavy quark mass alone, that is, no corrections of the form $(m^2/Q^2)^k$ for $k \geq 1$ to either the transverse or longitudinal fragmentation functions defined by

$$\hat{W}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_X \int d^4\xi e^{iq \cdot \xi} \langle 0 | J_\mu(\xi) | H(P)X \rangle \langle H(P)X | J_\nu(0) | 0 \rangle \quad (4.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= - \left(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{q_\mu q_\nu}{q^2} \right) \hat{w}_L(q^2, \nu) \\ &+ \left(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{P_\mu q_\nu + P_\nu q_\mu}{\nu} + \frac{P_\mu P_\nu q^2}{\nu^2} \right) \hat{w}_T(q^2, \nu), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where $\nu \equiv P \cdot q$. [The “fragmentation function” discussed in Section II is the scaling limit of $\hat{w}_T(q^2, \nu)$. The function $\hat{w}_L(q^2, \nu)$ vanishes at leading twist on account of a Callan–Gross-like relation.] At higher order in $\alpha_s(Q^2)$, there are radiative corrections which yield twist-four corrections of the form

$$\frac{m^2}{Q^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{\pi} \ln \frac{Q^2}{m^2} \right)$$

(as well as nonvanishing $\hat{w}_L(Q^2)$). Because of heavy quark constraints on matrix elements at the heavy quark scale it is possible to calculate the magnitude of these corrections exactly in terms of the leading twist heavy quark fragmentation function described in Section II. There are also corrections of order $m\Lambda/Q^2$ which can also be related to the leading twist fragmentation function and are calculable if Λ is known.

We conclude that the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P) + X$ will probably not have large higher twist corrections, even at relatively low center of mass energy. At heavy meson threshold, $Q^2 = 4M^2$, ordinary higher-twist corrections are suppressed by $\Lambda^2/Q^2 \approx \Lambda^2/4M^2 \ll 1$ so these are clearly small. Corrections of order $m\Lambda/4M^2$ are only of order 10 % for the c quark and smaller still for the b quark. However, this could confuse the extraction of an order ϵ^2 parameter. Corrections of order $m^2/4M^2 (\alpha(4M^2)/\pi) \ln(4M^2/m^2)$ are less than 5% for the c -quark and much smaller for the b -quark. These should be well under control.

Our results follow from simple considerations of the structure of heavy quark mass corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P)X$. The analysis is conceptually simpler for the deep inelastic scattering process $eH(p) \rightarrow eX$ where one can use the language of the operator product expansion. We will present our argument for deep inelastic scattering but it should hold equally well for $e^+e^- \rightarrow H(P)X$.

We first show that there are no corrections of the form $(m^2/Q^2)^k$. We work to lowest order in α_s . Since we are interested in effects of order $(m^2/Q^2)^k$, we may also set $\Lambda = 0$. Thus, we may ignore QCD entirely and calculate $eH(P) \rightarrow eX$ from a free, on-shell heavy quark h as shown in Fig. 1. This calculation, though trivial, gives us the information we require. This is true only because the relevant matrix elements are equal to their free field values up to non-perturbative corrections suppressed by ϵ . So at order ϵ^0 and α_s^0 , a free field theory analysis suffices.

Direct calculation of Fig. 1 gives

$$\hat{W}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{spins}} \bar{u}(P) \gamma_\mu (\not{q} + \not{P} + m) \delta \left[(q + P)^2 - m^2 \right] \gamma_\nu u(P) \quad (4.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} (\not{P} + m) (\gamma_\mu \not{q} + 2P_\mu) \delta (q^2 + 2q \cdot P) \gamma_\nu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{P_\mu q_\nu + P_\nu q_\mu}{\nu} - \frac{P_\mu P_\nu q^2}{\nu^2} \right) \delta(x - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

which is manifestly independent of the quark mass. Notice that because we have done this calculation in free field theory, the structure function itself is trivial: $f_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(x - 1)$ in the limit $\alpha_s, \Lambda \rightarrow 0$. This is the structure function of a free quark, the inverse Mellin transform of the matrix elements of the only twist-two operators which persist in this extreme limit:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}^n = \mathcal{S}_n \bar{h} \gamma_{\mu_1} \Pi_{\mu_2} \dots \Pi_{\mu_n} h - \text{traces} \quad (4.5),$$

all of which have identical coefficients ($A_k = 2$) in the operator product expansion. The matrix elements of the $\mathcal{O}^n$ will, in reality, deviate from the free field limit by corrections of order Λ/m — already described in Section II — but these modifications will not alter the relations among coefficient functions which result in the cancellation of all $\mathcal{O}(m^2/Q^2)^k$ terms from (4.4).

To understand this result more deeply and to see why the corrections of order $\frac{m^2}{Q^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{\pi} \ln \frac{Q^2}{m^2} \right)$ and $\Lambda m/Q^2$ are calculable, it is necessary to consider the process from the viewpoint of the operator product expansion. There are many sources of Q^2 suppressed corrections. The situation is made more tractable by working at tree level, postponing the study of the effects of evolution and operator mixing which will of course generate corrections of order α_s to this result. At tree level and through order $1/Q^2$ there has been a complete analysis of electroproduction with *massless* quarks.¹¹ The twist-four operators which appear

in that analysis include four-quark operators, generically $(\bar{h}h)^2$, two quark gluon, $\bar{h}Fh$, and two quark two gluon, $\bar{h}FFh$, operators. It is easy to see that, renormalized at a scale where the heavy quark effective theory applies, these operators contribute only at order Λ^2/Q^2 . The dangerous terms are those operators directly proportional to m or m^2 which were omitted from the calculation of Ref. [11]. Four categories of such contributions occur:

1. “Target mass corrections” — These well-known kinematic corrections were first understood completely by Nachtmann.¹² They arise when twist-two operators — traceless and symmetric in all indices — are projected out of the dominant operators which appear naturally in the expansion of two currents. Target mass corrections are proportional to $(M^2/Q^2)^k$ where M is the heavy meson mass, and their x -dependence is determined by the leading twist-two distribution or fragmentation function.
2. Modifications of the struck quark propagator — The replacement $1/p^2 \rightarrow 1/(p^2 - m^2)$ generates corrections of order $(m^2/Q^2)^k$ to the coefficient functions of the leading twist-two operators.
3. New twist-three operators with coefficient functions linear in m — The quark mass term in the Dirac propagator, $(\not{p} + m)/(p^2 - m^2)$, generates a tower of twist-three, chiral odd operators of the form $\bar{\psi}D_{\mu_1} \dots D_{\mu_n}\psi$ with coefficient functions linear in m . The matrix elements of these operators are proportional to M and the resulting corrections to the distribution and fragmentation functions are of order mM/Q^2 .
4. When twist-four operators are resolved into a canonical form in which gluon fields are manifest, it is necessary to use the QCD equations of motion. The use of the massive Dirac equation $(\not{D} - m)h = 0$ generates new twist-four operators proportional to m and m^2 .

A careful study of the operator product expansion at tree level through twist-four shows these are the only corrections through order m^2 .

The result of the operator product expansion calculation for the distribution function is most conveniently expressed as moments of the transverse and longitudinal structure functions, F_T and F_L , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F_T(x, Q^2) &= \frac{1}{2x} F_2(x, Q^2) \\ F_L(x, Q^2) &= \frac{1}{2x} \left(1 + \frac{4M^2 x^2}{Q^2} \right) F_2(x, Q^2) - F_1(x, Q^2) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Then our results are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_k^T(m^2) &= \int_0^1 dx x^{k-1} F_T(x, m^2) \\ &= \Gamma_k(m^2) + \frac{1}{Q^2} \frac{k-2}{k} \left\{ (k-3) M^2 \Gamma_k(m^2) - \frac{(k-1)(k+6)}{k} m^2 \Gamma_{k-2}(m^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{4k-3}{k} 2mM \Lambda_{k-2}(m^2) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_k^L(m^2) &= \int_0^1 dx x^{k-1} F_L(x, Q^2) \\ &= \frac{4}{Q^2} \frac{k-1}{k} \left\{ -M^2 \Gamma_k(m^2) - \frac{k-2}{k} m^2 \Gamma_{k-2}(m^2) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{k-1}{k} 2mM \Lambda_{k-2}(m^2) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where $k = 2, 4, 6, \dots$ and $\Gamma_k(m^2)$ and $\Lambda_k(m^2)$ are the matrix elements of twist-two and twist-three heavy quark operators, respectively (at the renormalization scale m^2):

$$\Gamma_k(m^2) = \left\langle H(P) \left| \bar{h} \not{n} (\Pi \cdot n)^{k-1} h \right| H(P) \right\rangle \Big|_{m^2} \quad (4.9)$$

$$M \Lambda_k(m^2) = \left\langle H(P) \left| \bar{h} (\Pi \cdot n)^k h \right| H(P) \right\rangle \Big|_{m^2} \quad . \quad (4.10)$$

The first term in (4.7) is the standard twist-two result. The other terms in (4.7) and (4.8) each consist of three parts. The first, proportional to $M^2 \Gamma_k$, are target mass corrections. The

second, proportional to $m^2\Gamma_{k-2}$, contain mass corrections to the struck quark propagator and operators generated by use of the Dirac equation. The third, proportional to $mM\Lambda_{k-2}$, originate in chiral odd, twist-three operators and also from use of the Dirac equation. The fact that these corrections can be grouped into transverse and longitudinal contributions is a consequence of the gauge invariance of virtual photon H -meson Compton scattering and is a highly non-trivial check on the algebra. So is the fact that (4.7) and (4.8) reduce to the free quark result, (4.4), when the $\{\Gamma_k\}$ and $\{\Lambda_k\}$ are set equal to their free quark values: $\Gamma_k(\text{free}) = \Lambda_k(\text{free}) = 2$.

In general, the $\{\Gamma_k\}$ and $\{\Lambda_k\}$ can be related by the QCD equations of motion:

$$m^2\bar{h}\not{n}(n\cdot\Pi)^{k-1}h = m\bar{h}(n\cdot\Pi)^k h + m\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-2}\bar{h}(n\cdot\Pi)^\ell\sigma^\alpha{}_\beta F^{\gamma\beta}n_\alpha n_\gamma(n\cdot\Pi)^{k-\ell-2}h \quad (4.11)$$

for $k > 1$, and

$$m^2\bar{h}\not{n}h = m\bar{h}n\cdot\Pi h$$

for $k = 1$. In general (*e.g.* for light quarks) the third operator in (4.11) obstructs any attempt to relate Γ_k to Λ_k . However, at the heavy quark scale it is easy to see that the matrix element of the third operator is of order Λ^2/m . Define

$$C^{(k)} \equiv \left\langle H(P) \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-2} \bar{h}(n\cdot\Pi)^\ell\sigma^\alpha{}_\beta F^{\gamma\beta}n_\alpha n_\gamma(n\cdot\Pi)^{k-\ell-2}h \right| H(P) \right\rangle. \quad (4.12)$$

At the heavy quark scale, numerator factors of m arise only from the substitution $\Pi^\mu = nv^\mu + k^\mu$, plus one additional factor from the norm of the Dirac fields. Each factor of n_μ contributes a factor $1/M$. The result is $C^{(k)} \propto m^{k-1}/M^k$, but on dimensional grounds $C^{(k)}$ scales like mass, so we conclude

$$C^{(k)} = \bar{C}^{(k)} \frac{\Lambda^2 m^{k-1}}{M^k} \quad (4.13)$$

to leading order in the heavy quark mass expansion. With this result in hand, we take the matrix element of (4.11) in a heavy meson state and find

$$m^2 \Gamma_k(m^2) = m M \Lambda_k(m^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2) \quad (4.14)$$

where we have restored the renormalization scale (m^2) as a label on the operator matrix elements to remind ourselves that (4.14) holds at the heavy quark scale. Substituting (4.14) into (4.7) and (4.8) we obtain the dominant twist-four corrections to the longitudinal and transverse moments at the heavy quark scale, m^2 :

$$\mathcal{M}_k^T(m^2) \Big|_{\text{twist-4}} = \frac{1}{Q^2} \frac{(k-2)(k-3)}{k} [M^2 \Gamma_k(m^2) - m^2 \Gamma_{k-2}(m^2)] + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2/Q^2) \quad (4.15)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_k^L(m^2) \Big|_{\text{twist-4}} = -\frac{4}{Q^2} \frac{k-1}{k} [M^2 \Gamma_k(m^2) - m^2 \Gamma_{k-2}(m^2)] + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2/Q^2) \quad (4.16)$$

$\Gamma_k(m^2)$ can be expressed in terms of A_0 , A_1 and B_1 (to order ϵ) by means of (3.7). m and M are related by $m = (1 - \epsilon)M$. Altogether

$$M^2 \Gamma_k(m^2) - m^2 \Gamma_{k-2}(m^2) = 2\epsilon A_1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.17)$$

so we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}_k^T(m^2) \Big|_{\text{twist-4}} = 4\epsilon \frac{M^2}{Q^2} A_1 \frac{(k-2)(k-3)}{k} \quad (4.18)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_k^L(m^2) \Big|_{\text{twist-4}} = -16\epsilon \frac{M^2}{Q^2} A_1 \frac{k-1}{k} . \quad (4.19)$$

Equations (4.18) and (4.19) hold at the heavy quark scale, $Q^2 = m^2$, and at higher scales, $Q^2 > m^2$, modulo QCD radiative corrections which are discussed below. Like other results which make use of the mass expansion, (3.7), they are valid only for low moments, for which $k \ll 1/\epsilon$ because we ignored $k^2 \epsilon^2$ compared to $k\epsilon$ in the derivation.

Equations (4.18) and (4.19) summarize our assertion that the leading higher-twist corrections to the scaling of distribution functions is of order $\Lambda M/Q^2$, and is calculable in terms of the parameter $\epsilon\tilde{A}_1$, which can, in principle, be extracted from the leading twist heavy quark distribution function. From the operator-product-expansion point-of-view, the cancellation of terms of order m^2/Q^2 among their several sources seems fortuitous. The simple graphical argument given at the beginning of this section gives a firm physical basis for the cancellation. It also assures us that the same result holds for fragmentation functions for which operator product expansion methods are less straightforward.

Finally, it is necessary to comment on the effect of QCD radiative corrections on these results. We focus on the moments, $\mathcal{M}_k^T(Q^2)$ and $\mathcal{M}_k^L(Q^2)$, defined by (4.7) and (4.8). The operators parameterized by $\Gamma_k(Q^2)$ and $\Lambda_k(Q^2)$ have different anomalous dimensions so the cancellation of m^2/Q^2 terms, which was complete at m^2 , is incomplete at Q^2 . The terms which survive are clearly $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2}{Q^2} \frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{\pi} \ln \frac{Q^2}{m^2}\right)$. To establish the way to compute these terms it is necessary first to examine the Q^2 values of interest. For $Q^2 \gg m^2$ one could use standard, leading order renormalization group evolution. However, for $Q^2 \gg m^2$ twist-four effects are unlikely to be measurable in the first place. We are more likely to be interested in $Q^2 \gtrsim m^2$ where twist-four effects might be measured. At such scales there is no reason to ignore $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s(Q^2)/\pi)$ corrections to coefficient functions. Fortunately, there is a direct way to compute all relevant corrections of order $\frac{m^2}{Q^2} \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \ln \frac{Q^2}{m^2}$: since Λ may be taken to zero in these calculations, they may be extracted from the Feynman diagram calculation of the appropriate process involving free, on-shell heavy quarks — the same method we used to show corrections of order m^2/Q^2 vanish at the beginning of this section. The relevant diagrams are shown in Fig. 2. The processes shown in Figs. 2b – 2d, which involve mixing of gluonic and quark-gluon

operators in the language of the operator product expansion, are easily seen to be suppressed by Λ^2/Q^2 . Thus it is a matter of straightforward calculation to compute the set of all important $1/Q^2$ corrections to heavy quark fragmentation or distribution functions: corrections of order $\Lambda M/Q^2$ have been calculated in this paper; corrections of order $\frac{m^2}{Q^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \ln \frac{Q^2}{M^2}$ can be obtained from calculation of Feynman diagrams involving on-shell heavy quarks.

V. CONCLUSION

There are only very few places where one can hope to extract mass suppressed contributions to matrix elements. The existence of these additional parameters should be very important from the point of view of testing heavy quark symmetry at subleading order. Furthermore, it will be useful to see what the size of mass suppressed corrections really turns out to be in order to test the validity of the heavy quark expansion.

Clearly the ideas of this paper need to be tested by application to existent and future data. Future work would involve incorporating subleading evolution and calculation of the perturbative higher twist effects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank Valerie Khoze, Michael Luke, Anatoly Radysuhkin, Martin Savage, for many helpful conversations and suggestions on subjects related to this work. This work was begun while the authors attended the Aspen Center for Physics and the Santa Fe Study Group. We would like to thank the organizers of those programs for their generous support. L. R. would like to thank the CERN Theory division for their hospitality while this work was being completed.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: Virtual Compton scattering of a current coupled only to h -quarks from a heavy meson, H , with momentum P . The imaginary part is proportional to the distribution function, $f(x, Q^2)$, at large- Q^2 . Only the dominant process at large- Q^2 is shown, exclusive of QCD radiative corrections.

Figure 2: The cross section for an h -quark current to produce an H -meson plus anything in the deep-inelastic limit. Only the dominant contribution at large- Q^2 is shown, exclusive of QCD radiative corrections. The cross section is proportional to $\hat{f}(x, Q^2)$.

REFERENCES

1. B. Adeva *et al.* (L3 Collaboration) *Phys. Lett.* **B261** (1991) 177; D. Decamp *et al.* (ALEPH Collaboration) *Phys. Lett.* **B244** (1990) 551.
2. D. Bortoletto *et al.* *Phys. Rev.* **D37** (1988) 1719.
3. C. Petersen *et al.* *Phys. Rev.* **D27** (1983) 105.
4. V. A. Khoze, SLAC-PUB-5909, talk presented at the XXVI International Conference on High Energy Physics, Dallas, 1992
5. B. Mele and P. Nason, *Phys. Lett.* **B245** (1990) 635, *Nucl. Phys.* **B361** (1991) 626.
6. R. L. Jaffe in *Relativistic Dynamics and Quark-Nuclear Physics*, M. B. Johnson and A. Pickleshimer, eds. (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1986).
7. J. C. Collins and D. E. Soper, *Nucl. Phys.* **B194** (1982) 445.
8. A. Bassetto, M. Ciafaloni and G. Marchesini, *Phys. Rep.* **100** (1983) 201.
9. M. Luke, *Phys. Lett.* **B252** (1990) 447.
10. R. L. Jaffe, in preparation.
11. R. L. Jaffe and M. Soldate, *Phys. Rev.* **D26** (1982) 49.
12. O. Nachtmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B63** (1973) 237, **B78** (1974) 455.